



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/655,929	09/06/2000	Garland Stephens	8224.003.NPUS00	8518
28694 7590 02/01/2011 NOVAK DRUCE + QUIGG LLP 300 NEW JERSEY AVENUE, NW FIFTH FLOOR WASHINGTON, DC 20001				
EXAMINER				
NGUYEN, NGA B				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3684				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/01/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/655,929

Applicant(s)

STEPHENS ET AL.

Examiner

Nga B. Nguyen

Art Unit

3684

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12 and 28-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12 and 28-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-896)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the communication filed on November 1, 2010, which paper has been placed of record in the file.
2. Claims **12 and 28-30** are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments/Amendment

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 12 and 28-30 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.
4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claims 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to Functional Descriptive material per se (software per se). Data structures not claimed as embodied in computer-readable media are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer. See, e.g., Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory). Such claimed data structures do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and other claimed aspects of the invention which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 12 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hausman et al (hereinafter Hausman), U.S. Patent No. 6,086,619, in view of May, U.S. Patent No. 6,317,727.

Regarding to claims 12 and 28, Hausman discloses a method for optimizing operation of a system of production, the method comprising:

in an electronic system comprising one or more processors and one or more memories, establishing via processor instruction, in the one or more memories a data structure corresponding to a graph having nodes (*column 2, lines 60-65, the general purpose computer that has been programmed using software called "NETCORE" to constitute an apparatus implementing the method; figures 16-23 and column 6, lines 40-67, a graph consists of a finite set of nodes and edges*);

a portion of the data structure corresponding to at least one edge (*figures 16-23 and column 6, lines 40-67, a graph consists of a finite set of nodes and edges*);

determining, via processor instruction, data corresponding to a linear combination of edges corresponding to a maximum notional amount for the graph

(column 7, lines 20-65, Netcore allows arbitrary groups of network elements to be defined and maximum, minimum or fixed values to be defined for the total value over those groups).

Hausman does not disclose a method for determining a set of structured cash flow for exchanges comprising: nodes corresponding to a collection of at least partial exchange definitions/cash flow definitions including at least one partial swap definition, and edge between exchange definitions/cash flow definitions having at least partially compatibles terms including at least one of: an underlying, a start date, an end date, and a variance. However, May discloses a method for determining a set of structured cash flow for exchanges comprising: a collection of at least partial exchange definitions/cash flow definitions including at least one partial swap definition, and exchange definitions/cash flow definitions having at least partially compatibles terms including *at least one of*: an underlying, a start date, an end date, and a variance *(column 18, lines 3-40, column 20, lines 5-65, swap transactions; column 20, lines 35-55, an underlying, start date, end date; column 20, line 65-column 21, line 10, and example of an order)*. Note that the claimed invention described nothing more than constructing a graph contains nodes and edges and applying specific financial data (exchange definitions/cash flow definitions for nodes, compatible terms for edges) into the graph. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hausman's to apply the exchange definitions/cash flow definitions and the compatible terms as taught by May, into

Hausman's nodes and edges, for the purpose of enhancing the method for determining a set of structured cash flow for the exchanges.

9. Claims 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hausman et al (hereinafter Hausman), U.S. Patent No. 6,086,619, in view of Young et al (hereinafter Young), U.S. Patent No. 6,393,409.

Regarding to claims 29 and 30, Hausman discloses a software product comprising: digital information storage media; and processor instructions, residing on the media, and operable, when executed by at least one processor, to determine a linear combination of structured data having a net present value of substantially zero and corresponding to maximum flow/minimum cut for a graph having at least one node (*column 2, lines 60-65, the general purpose computer that has been programmed using software called "NETCORE" to constitute an apparatus implementing the method; figures 16-23 and column 6, lines 40-67, a graph consists of a finite set of nodes and edges; column 7, lines 20-65, Netcore allows arbitrary groups of network elements to be defined and maximum, minimum or fixed values to be defined for the total value over those groups*).

Hausman does not disclose cash flow exchange having a net present value of substantially zero and having at least one node corresponding to at least one swap such that the set of structured cash flow exchanges determined thereby is substantially hedged. However, John discloses cash flow exchange having a net present value of substantially zero and at least one swap transaction such that the set of structured cash flow exchanges determined thereby is substantially hedged (*column 7, lines 1-25, swap*

transaction; column 8, lines 5-15, the amounts bought and sold over all participating firms must net to zero). Note that the claimed invention described nothing more than constructing a graph contains nodes and applying specific financial data (swap transaction for nodes) into the graph. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hausman's to apply the swap transactions as taught by John into Hausman's nodes, for the purpose of enhancing the method for determining a set of structured cash flow for the exchanges.

Conclusion

10. Claims **12 and 28-30** are rejected.
11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Nga B. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-6796. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 9:00AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Abdi can be reached on (571) 272-6702.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-3600.

12. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300 (for formal communication intended for entry),

or

(571) 273-6796 (for informal or draft communication, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nga B. Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3684

January 25, 2011

